1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JAMES F. PIFER,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-87-1623 FCD KJM P
12	vs.
13	DANIEL MCCARTHY, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	On October 12, 2005, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the magistrate
17	judge's order filed September 30, 2005, denying plaintiff's December 29, 2004 motion to compel
18	with some exceptions. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall
19	be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court
20	finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary
21	to law.
22	Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the
23	magistrate judge filed September 30, 2005, is affirmed.
24	DATED:October 26, 2005
25	
26	/s/ Frank C. Damrell Jr. FRANK C. DAMRELL JR. United States District Judge